



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,325	11/12/2003	Jean-Marc Lalancette	GOUD:044US	6481

32425 7590 10/05/2006  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
600 CONGRESS AVE.  
SUITE 2400  
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

FIORITO, JAMES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,325

Applicant(s)

LALANCETTE, JEAN-MARC

Examiner

James A. Fiorito

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/06, 2/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-2, 4-5, 17-19, 22-23, 34, and 39-41 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fleming '812.**

Fleming teaches a method for treating a polymetallic sulfide ore containing gold or silver, and further comprising a base metal selected from the group consisting of iron, aluminum, chromium, titanium, copper, zinc, lead, nickel, cobalt, mercury, tin, and mixtures thereof (Column 1), the method comprising: (a) grinding said polymetallic ore to produce granules (Column 3 Lines 5-6); (b) oxidizing said granules at temperatures of at least about 300 degrees C to produce oxidized granules (Column 2 Lines 53-55); (c) chloride leaching said oxidized granules to produce a pregnant solution of solubilized metal chlorides and a barren solid (Figure 1); (d) recovering said barren solid from said

Art Unit: 1754

pregnant solution to produce a purified pregnant solution (Figure 1); and (e) selectively recovering gold or silver from said purified pregnant solution yielding a solution essentially deprived of gold or silver (Column 5). Activated Carbon is used to remove the gold and silver from the leach solution (Column 5). The ore is leached with a halide salt selected from the group, chloride, iodide and bromide, at a concentration of 0.5 to about 100g/L (Column 2 Lines 5-18).

**Claims 3, 13, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming '812 as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 17-19, 22-23, 34, and 39-41 above, and further in view of Hannaford '373.**

Fleming does not teach that said oxidizing is performed using lean air.

Hannaford teaches a method oxidizing sulfide ore containing gold, wherein sulfur is converted to SO<sub>2</sub>, oxidation occurs at a temperature of 450 to 800 degrees C (Column 5-6) in an oxygen-containing atmosphere of at least 1% by volume (Column 5-6). Fleming and Hannaford are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processes of removing gold from ore.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to perform the oxidizing step using lean air in view of the teaching of Hannaford. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to remove arsenic from the ore (Column 5-6).

**Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming '812 in view of Hannaford '373 as applied to claims 1-3, 4-5, 13, 17-19, 22-23, 34-41 above, and further in view of Lalancette WO 98/06878.**

Art Unit: 1754

Fleming in view of Hannaford does not expressly state that the lean air and sulfur dioxide is directed to a sulfur dioxide scrubbing unit.

Lalancette teaches a process of roasting sulfide-containing ore wherein the sulfur dioxide is directed to a scrubbing unit (Figure 1). Lalancette uses lime to scrub the sulfur dioxide from the gas phase (Figure 1). Fleming, Hannaford and Lalancette are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely process of removing gold from ore.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Fleming in view of Hannaford to include the step of scrubbing the sulfur dioxide in the gas phase in view of the teaching of Lalancette. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to precipitate the sulfur dioxide into the insoluble salt calcium sulfate (Page 9 Line 14-20).

**Claims 14-16 and 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming '812 as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 17-19, 22-23, 34, and 39-41 above, and further in view of Lalancette WO 02/053788.**

Fleming does not expressly state that a brine solution is circulated through an electrolytic cell to separately and concomitantly produce a caustic solution and said brine solution including dissolved halogens, and wherein said brine solution including dissolved halogens is combined with a second portion of said brine solution to produce said leaching solution.

Lalancette teaches a process of recovering gold including a brine solution is circulated through an electrolytic cell to separately and concomitantly produce a caustic

Art Unit: 1754

solution and said brine solution including dissolved halogens, and wherein said brine solution including dissolved halogens is combined with a second portion of said brine solution to produce said leaching solution (Figure 1). The brine consists of NaCl or KCl at concentrations near saturation, leaching occurs at temperatures between 40-50 degrees C (Page 6). Fleming and Lalancette are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely process of removing gold from ore.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Fleming to include the step of a brine solution is circulated through an electrolytic cell to separately and concomitantly produce a caustic solution and said brine solution including dissolved halogens, and wherein said brine solution including dissolved halogens is combined with a second portion of said brine solution to produce said leaching solution and the brine consists of NaCl or KCl at concentrations near saturation, leaching occurs at temperatures between 40-50 degrees C in view of the teaching of Lalancette. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to solubilize different metals according to the appropriate chloride ion strength (Page 4 Lines 9-17).

**Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming '812 as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 17-19, 22-23, 34, and 39-41 above, and further in view of Kerfoot '604.**

Fleming does not expressly state that the solution deprived of gold or silver is treated with a caustic solution to produce a first reaction mixture having a pH ranging from about 2.5 to about 3.5, further producing a precipitate comprising a first set of base

Art Unit: 1754

metals comprising a hydrated metal oxide selected from the group consisting of iron, aluminum, chromium and titanium, and recovering said precipitate yielding a first solution essentially devoid of iron, aluminum, chromium and titanium.

Kerfoot teaches a ore leaching process wherein iron is precipitated from the leach solution by raising the pH of the solution in the range of 3.5-4.0 (Column 9 Lines 23-35). Fleming and Kerfoot are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely process of leaching ore with chlorine.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Fleming to include that the solution deprived of gold or silver is treated with a caustic solution to produce a first reaction mixture having a pH ranging from about 2.5 to about 3.5, further producing a precipitate comprising a first set of base metals comprising a hydrated metal oxide selected from the group consisting of iron, aluminum, chromium and titanium, and recovering said precipitate yielding a first solution essentially devoid of iron, aluminum, chromium and titanium in view of the teaching of Kerfoot. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to remove iron from the leach solution (Column 9 Lines 23-35).

**Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleming '812 in view of Kerfoot '604 as applied to claims 1-2, 4-6, 17-20, 22-23, 34, and 39-41 above, and further in view of Tuwiner '669.**

Fleming in view of Kerfoot does not expressly state the step of treating said first solution with a caustic solution to produce a second reaction mixture having a pH ranging from about 3.5 to about 14, further producing a precipitate including a second

Art Unit: 1754

set of base metals comprising a hydrated metal oxide selected from the group consisting of nickel, copper, cobalt, zinc, lead and tin, and recovering said precipitate yielding a second solution essentially devoid of nickel, copper, cobalt, zinc, lead and tin.

Tuwiner teaches a process of removing copper and chromium from a gold cyanide leach solution by raising the pH of the solution to the range of 8-9 (Column 6 Lines 55-65 and Column 2 Lines 10-20). Fleming, Kerfoot and Tuwiner are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely processes that treat gold leach solutions.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the process of Fleming in view of Kerfoot to include the step of treating said first solution with a caustic solution to produce a second reaction mixture having a pH ranging from about 3.5 to about 14, further producing a precipitate including a second set of base metals comprising a hydrated metal oxide selected from the group consisting of nickel, copper, cobalt, zinc, lead and tin, and recovering said precipitate yielding a second solution essentially devoid of nickel, copper, cobalt, zinc, lead and tin in view of the teaching of Kerfoot. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to remove copper and chromium from the leach solution (Column 2 Lines 10-20).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Fiorito whose telephone number is (571)272-7426. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Fiorito  
Patent Examiner  
AU 1754

JF

  
Steven Bos  
Primary Patent Examiner  
AU 1754